

tera, to take the first species uniformly as type would cause considerably less change in the present classification than to take the middle species. In the Lepidoptera, either course would cause a very radical change, about equal in either case. It has been proposed to cite as type of the Linnæan genera the common European species included under each. This is objectionable, because it is not capable of general application, as there are some groups without any common European species and others with two or more.

We are reduced therefore to squarely favor the first species method. Let us make what changes this requires now, which are perhaps not so many, and have the names finally settled on a permanent basis.

### BOOK NOTICES.

*The International Code of Zoölogical Nomenclature as Applied to Medicine.* By CH. WARDELL STILES. Bulletin No. 24 of the Hygienic Laboratory, Treasury Department, Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service of the United States. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1905.

This very important paper presents the international code in available form with explanatory comment by the author, who is well qualified to explain the code, being the secretary of the permanent committee of the International Zoölogical Congress. There are 36 articles and a valuable appendix giving rules for the transcription of Greek words and geographic names to be in Latin form. These rules would be more valuable if there were any obligation in the code itself to respect them, which there is not. Unfortunately the code does not embody the recommendations which we have urged in editorial comment in this Journal and in an article with Mr. Caudell on the types of genera (Journ. N. Y. Ent. Soc., XII, 120, 1904). We object to articles 4, 5, 14, 25 and 30.

Articles 4 and 5 do not go far enough. They state how the family name shall be formed, but do not tell us how to select the type genus. Is it to be the oldest one, or the one first selected historically? When changed, why should the name not go to the next oldest one (as advocated by us), or to the one next used for family type historically, rather than to the substituted name (as advocated by article 5)?

Article 14 states that specific names in adjective form must agree

in gender with the generic name. We object to this. It is perhaps easy to determine the gender of the old classical Latin names, but not so those of Latinized Greek or barbarous generic names. Of these there are already more than the pure Latin names, and we shall have an increasingly larger proportion in the future. We regard it as far simpler to write the specific name exactly as first proposed.

We would note that by article 25 the definition of a genus by citation of type, without description, seems accepted, the rule stating that a name must be published, accompanied by an *indication* or a definition or a description. But, as this applies also to specific names, we object, on the ground that an "indication" is not a sufficient specific description.

Article 30 tells us how to determine the types of genera. This is the most complicated set of recommendations we have seen. Both the methods of elimination are endorsed, although it has been shown that they are contradictory in their results, while the method of first species is not even mentioned. We defy any two workers to arrive at the same type for any complicated genus by using these rules and working independently. If the recommendations and the discussion be cut off, the rule itself is simple enough, being the plain historical method advocated in these pages by Prout. The discussion here only confuses an originally simple proposition; but it serves to show into what shape an apparently simple proposition can be twisted, and is a valuable exposition, we should say, of what not to do.

With these exceptions we find this presentation of this most recent code to be excellent. We infer that the publication is generally available from the statement that it will be sent to "nonpublishing societies and individuals in case sufficient reason can be shown why such societies or individuals should receive it," which statement we find on the cover. Application should be made to the Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, Washington, D. C.

*Monograph of the Bombycine Moths of North America*, including their transformations and origin of the larval markings and armature. Part II. Family CERATOCAMPIDÆ, Subfamily CERATOCAMPINÆ. By ALPHEUS SPRING PACKARD. Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. ix, pp. 1-149, plates I-LXI. 1905.

This valuable work gives, in a wealth of detail, the life histories of